

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION N	o.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,895		12/10/2003	Cheng-Le Zhao	IN-9524	8613
54308	7590	05/10/2006		EXAMINER	
BASF AC	_	RASSE 38	CHEUNG, WILLIAM K		
6700 LUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		ΓΖ D-67056,	1713		
GERMANY				DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/733,895	ZHAO, CHENG-LE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William K. Cheung	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 M	arch 2006.					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.					
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	63 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the approximate the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	vn from consideration.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	election requirement.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/733,895 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-5, 7-14 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-5, 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rokowski et al. (US 5,534,310) for the reasons adequately set forth from paragraph 4 of the non-final office of October 26, 2005.

Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

Applicant's arguments filed March 27, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Rokowski et al. argue that the neutralization step of Rokowski et al. is for the neutralizing the anionic surfactants of Rokowski et al. while the claimed invention is to neutralize the claimed acidic monomer. However, the examiner disagrees because the invention of Rokowski et al. (col. 16, example 8) clearly disclose a method involving Triton® X-405, which is a non-ionic surfactant. Regarding applicants' argument that Rokowski et al. use ammonia to neutralize an anionic surfactant, applicants fail to recognize that Rokowski et al. also involve adding additional ammonia to bring the latex polymer to have a final pH to 9.0 (col. 11-12, examples 1 and 2). Therefore, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the acidic monomers of Rokowski et al. are also neutralized.

## Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1713

final action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tollfree).

William K. Cheung, Ph. D.

**Primary Examiner** 

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG

May 9, 2006

PRIMARY EXAMINER